

REMARKS

Claims 1-56 are pending in this application, however, claims 15-28, 30, 41-50, 52, 54, and 56 have been withdrawn from consideration as directed to a nonelected invention. In the Office Action dated December 9, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 6-14, and 29 and objected to claims 2-5. In particular, claims 1, 6-9, 11, 13, and 14 were rejected under 25 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,610,229 B1 ("Morales et al."). In addition, claims 1, 6-14 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,101,254 ("Wiltshire") in view of Morales et al. The Examiner objected to claims 2-5 but indicated that those claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Finally, the Examiner allowed claims 31-40, 51, 53, and 55.

As indicated above, Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 29. In light of these amendments and the remarks below, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections and objections be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1, 6-9, 11, 13, and 14 Under 102(e) Over Morales et al.

In order to anticipate claims 1, 6-9, 11, 13, and 14, Morales et al. must disclose each and every element of the rejected claims. MPEP § 2131 (8th Ed., revised Oct. 2005). As indicated above, Applicants have amended claim 1 (from which claims 6-9, 11, 13, and 14 depend). Specifically, Applicants have amended claim 1 to specify "creating a vacuum in the mandrel after the part has been formed on the mandrel" and "applying a debonding agent on the surface of the mandrel after the part has been formed on the mandrel." Because Morales et al. does not disclose every element of

these claims as amended, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Specifically, Morales et al. does not disclose “creating a vacuum in the mandrel after the part has been formed on the mandrel.” In Morales et al., a vacuum is applied to the tooling while the part is being formed, (Col. 2, l. 40-60), not “after the part has been formed.” In addition, Morales et al. does not disclose “applying a debonding agent on the surface of the mandrel after the part has been formed on the mandrel.” In Morales et al., the coating on the surface of the tooling is applied prior to part formation. (Col. 3, l. 1-15, claims 1, 5.) Therefore, Morales et al. does not disclose at least these limitations of these claims.

Because Morales et al. does not disclose every element of the claims as amended, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 6-9, 11, 13, and 14.

Rejection of Claims 1, 6-14, and 29
Under 103(a) Over Wiltshire in View of Morales et al.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under § 103(a), the MPEP requires that the Examiner demonstrate (1) some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or combine reference teachings; (2) a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) that the prior art references teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP § 2142 (8th Ed., revised Oct. 2005). As indicated above, Applicants have amended claim 1 (from which claims 6-14 depend). In addition, Applicants have also amended claim 29 consistent with the edits to claim 1. Because neither Wiltshire nor Morales et al. teaches or suggests all the limitations of claims 1, 6-14, and 29 as amended, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

All of the rejected claims now require “creating a vacuum in the mandrel after the part has been formed on the mandrel” and “applying a debonding agent on the surface of the mandrel after the part has been formed on the mandrel.” As discussed above, Morales et al. does not disclose either of these elements. The Examiner acknowledged that Wiltshire does not disclose applying a debonding agent at any time. (Office Action at 5.) Moreover, as with Morales et al., Wiltshire only discloses application of a vacuum during part formation, (Col. 4-5, claim 1), not “after the part has been formed on the mandrel.” Therefore, these references do not teach or suggest all the limitations of these claims.

Since neither Wiltshire nor Morales et al. teach or suggest all the limitations of these claims, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner withdraw this rejection as well for claims 1, 6-14, and 29.

Objection to Claims 2-5

The Examiner objected to claims 2-5 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicants have now rewritten claims 2, 4, and 5 in independent form including all the limitations of base claim 1. In light of these amendments, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this objection.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 9, 2006

By: 

D. Brian Kacedon
Reg. No. 46,814